

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/537,961	10/537,961 06/09/2005		Reijo Kuivikko	43480-218348	7220	
23517	7590	06/15/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		JTCHEN LLP	REDDING,	REDDING, DAVID A		
3000 K ST BOX IP	3000 K STREET, NW BOX IP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHING	TON, DO	C 20007	1744			
				DATE MAIL ED: 06/15/2004	DATE MAIL ED: 06/15/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<u> </u>					
		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/537,961	KUIVIKKO ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		David A. Redding	1744					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DONA INSIGN OF THE MAILING DONA INSIGN OF THE MAILING DONA IN THE MAILING THE MAILIN	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status			•					
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
'=	•	action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.							
_	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🖾	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10)	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
_	12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents		an Na					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	 Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 							
* S	* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
		,	-					
Attachmen	t(s)							
1) 🛛 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/9/05</u> .	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 specifies a coupling system for coupling the bristle segments with the disc using a "snap fit principle". It is indefinite as to what structural limitations are defined by a "snap fit".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2,7,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by FR 2614188 (Abstract).

The figure shows a side brush comprising a base element (13) and a plurality of individual bristle segments (3) integrated into a solid frame (16). The base element as shown is a planar disc. The disc comprises elongated channels (14) into which the solid frame slidingly engages. Since the brush of the French patent abstract comprises all of

Application/Control Number: 10/537,961 Page 3

Art Unit: 1744

the structure the coupling between the frame (16) and (channel (14) is considered to inherently constitute a snap fit.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/537,961

Art Unit: 1744

Claims 6,10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2614188 in view of USP 3,875,607 (Rosseau).

The FR patent is silent as to the composition of the brush. The Rosseau patent discloses a street sweeping brush comprised of steel bristles. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use steel bristles in the brush of the FR patent in view of the known practice as disclosed in Rosseau.

Claims 5,6,8,9,12,13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2614188 in view of US 2003/0172484.

The Lendabarker publication discloses a street sweeping brush composed of polypropylene (27,28) brushes and a brush composed of two different material types (figure 7a). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use polypropylene bristles in the FR patent or two different material types in view of the known practice as disclosed in the Lendabarker publication.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2614188 in view of USP 5,819,357 (Gould).

Gould discloses a street sweeping brush in which bristle tufts ends are fused into the tuft holder (col.5, lines 1-24). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use fused brush segments in the FR patent in view of the known practice as disclosed in the Gould patent.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A. Redding whose telephone number is 571-272-1276. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 6:00 - 3:00.

Art Unit: 1744

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran-Piazza can be reached on 571-272-1224. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-100%

David A Redding Primary Examiner Art Unit 1744

DAR